

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended and claim 10 has been canceled for clarity. Claim 11 has been newly added. Support for all amended claim can be found in the specification, and no new matter has been added by these amendments. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and following remarks.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In order to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, 7th compound on page 15 of the previously presented claims has been deleted. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is requested.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda et al. (US 7,429,425). Applicant traverses the rejection for the following reasons. Applicant has added the features of claim 10 to claim 1. Thus, amended claim 1 now includes an emitting layer having a blue emitting material selected from listed compounds (S-1 to S-89) as a dopant and a material of the chemical formula 2. Ikeda fails to anticipate the blue emitting material selected from listed compounds, S-1 to S-89 of the claim 1.

Accordingly, the claim 1 is clearly different from Ikeda, since the presently claimed invention has different compounds as the blue emitting material that are not anticipated by Ikeda. Claims 2 and 5, which depend on independent claim 1, are also patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, as well as for their own additional features that they each recite.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. Claim 9 is therefore allowable.

New Claim 11

Claim 11 depending upon claim 9 has been added. Accordingly, claim 11 is also patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to base claim 9, as well as on their own merits.

For these reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-2353. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Dated: July 27, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Donald L. Monin, Jr./
Donald L. Monin, Jr.
Registration No.: 47,256
Holland & Knight LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. – Suite 100
Washington, DC 20006-6801
(202) 419-2521 - Telephone
(202) 955-5564 - Facsimile

8736492_v1